



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,867	06/18/2001	Glenn Hogle	1161-1.CIP	3059

24955 7590 04/25/2003

ROGITZ & ASSOCIATES
750 B STREET
SUITE 3120
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, ANTHONY H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,867

Applicant(s)

HOGLE ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony H Nguyen

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 14 February 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2854

The terminal disclaimer filed on February 14, 2003 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Number 09/521,581 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Weber et al. (US 5,616,897).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, Weber et al. teaches a support platform having a lower plate 20, an upper plate (no numeral reference) which supports keys 13, a bladder 40 (Figs.6 and 9) disposed between the plates and a pump 43 which communicates with the bladder for moving the upper plate with respect to the lower plate.

With respect to claim 16, the use of a bleed orifice in fluid communication with the bladder while not specifically shown in Weber et al. is necessary to provide an operative device.

With respect to claim 23, Weber teaches the upper plate which is pivotally attached to the lower plate as shown in Fig.6 of Weber et al.

Art Unit: 2854

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US 5,616,897) in view of Brown (US 5,806,115).

Weber et al. teaches all that is claimed as explained above, except for a controller electrically connected to the pump. Brown teaches an adjustable position control system having a controller 22 which is electrically connected to a pump for adjusting the position of a support plate 33 (Brown, Figs. 3-5). In view of the teaching of Brown, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the support platform of Weber et al. by providing the controller as taught by Brown to improve the efficiency of typing on a keyboard.

With respect to claim 18, the selection of a desired period of energizing or deenergizing the pump would be obvious through routine experimentation in order to get best use of a keyboard by an operator.

Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US 5,616,897) in view of McConnell (US 5,037,054).

With respect to claims 19, 20 and 21, Weber et al. teaches all that is claimed, except for the support platform which is attached to an articulated arm extending from a desk. McConnell teaches a keyboard support platform 24 attached to an arm 18 extending from a desk 10. In view of the teaching of McConnell, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 2854

modify the support platform of Weber et al. by attaching the support platform to an articulated arm as taught by McConnell for more precise controlling of the position of a keyboard for typing.

With respect to claims 22 and 24, the selection of a desired location that the bladder is disposed or moved within the support platform would be obvious through routine experimentation for more comfort position of operating a keyboard.


Conclusion

Applicant's response have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-2869. The examiner can normally be reached daily from 9 AM to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld, can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Anthony Nguyen
4/23/03
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800